

**Table e-1 – Characteristics of The Children and The Parents, and MR Scanner Type Across Six Genotype Groups (mean ± standard errors)**

	<i>APOE</i> ε2/ε2 <sup>§</sup>	<i>APOE</i> ε2/ε3	<i>APOE</i> ε3/ε3	<i>APOE</i> ε3/ε4	<i>APOE</i> ε4/ε4	<i>APOE</i> ε2/ε4	<b>One-way ANOVA or X<sup>2</sup> p-values</b>
<b><i>Children Characteristics</i></b>							
<i>APOE</i> ε genotype frequency, n (%)	2 (0.17)	141 (11.9)	733 (61.78)	259 (21.8)	21 (1.75)	31 (2.6)	0.40*
Boys /Girls	0/2	67/74	390/343	137/122	12/9	12/19	0.28
Age (years)	9.04±2.57	13.26±0.38	11.86±0.18	12.05±0.30	10.44±1.04	11.11±0.95	<b>0.03</b>
GAF_Europe**	0.60±0.40	0.60±0.35	0.65±0.01	0.59±0.02	0.35±0.07	0.71±0.07	<b>0.003</b>
GAF_Africa	0.04±0.04	0.14±0.02	0.10±0.008	0.17±0.02	0.36±0.09	0.16±0.06	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
GAF_American Indian	0	0.02±0.005	0.05±0.005	0.04±0.007	0.03±0.01	0.004±0.002	<b>0.003</b>
GAF_East Asia	0.29±0.29	0.22±0.03	0.15±0.01	0.16±0.02	0.24±0.08	0.12±0.05	0.16
GAF_Oceania	0.08±0.08	0.008±0.002	0.007±0.001	0.01±0.002	0.02±0.009	0.003±0.002	<b>0.002</b>
GAF_Central Asia	0	0.013±0.007	0.03±0.006	0.018±0.006	0	0.004±0.003	0.23
<b><i>Parent/Guardian Characteristics</i></b>							
Household Income: 1=<\$5K; 6=40K-50K, 12=≥\$300K	7.00±1.00	6.74±0.22	6.90±0.09	6.52±0.16	5.48±0.46	6.84±0.41	0.07
Highest Education: 7=Professional, 4=High School Graduate, 1=<7 yrs of school	5.5±0.50	5.77±0.10	5.86±0.04	5.61±0.08	5.19±0.26	6.07±0.20	<b>0.007<sup>‡</sup></b>
Highest Occupation: 7=Higher Executives, 4=Clerical & Sales Worker, 1=Unskilled employees	5.00±1.00	5.01±0.15	5.20±0.06	4.85±0.11	3.8±0.41	5.03±0.30	<b>0.001<sup>‡</sup></b>
<b><i>MR Scanners</i></b>							
General Electric Medical	0	20	144	52	0	5	0.14
Philips Medical	1	25	110	46	2	2	
Siemens	1	96	479	161	19	24	

<sup>§</sup> Data for the ε2ε2 children were excluded from all statistical models.

\* Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium was found for *APOE*ε genotype frequency (p=0.4) and for the allelic frequency at rs7412 (p=0.06). As expected, the allelic frequency at rs429358 deviates from HWE (p<0.0001).

\*\* The number for GAF refers to the children with the particular fraction of genetic ancestry in that genotype group.

<sup>‡</sup> When corrected for GAF, the highest education (p=0.03) and occupation levels (p=0.04) still differ across the 5 *APOE* genotype groups. p-values < 0.05 were considered significant (bold font).

**Table e-2. Volumes or Fractional Anisotropy in Subcortical Brain Regions That Showed Age –by-Genotype Effects**

Regions Of Interest (ROI)	General Additive Models* (n=1,080)					
	Volume			Fractional Anisotropy		
	<i>APOEε</i> Effect	Age Effect	Age x <i>APOEε</i> Interaction	<i>APOEε</i> Effect	Age Effect	Age x <i>APOEε</i> Interaction
Estimated Mean±SD (p-value)	p-value	R <sup>2</sup> Adjusted, % Explained Deviance (p-value)	Estimated Mean±SD (p-value)	(p-value)	R <sup>2</sup> Adjusted, % Explained Deviance (p-value)	
<b>L_Hippocampus</b>	0.28±0.55 (0.02)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.418, 43.3% (0.009)	0.004±0.003 (0.12)	0.79	<b>0.175, 19.6%</b> <b>(0.01)</b>
<b>R_Hippocampus</b>	<b>0.50±0.55</b> <b>(0.001)</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.405, 42.1% (0.02)	0.004±0.002 (0.07)	0.55	<b>0.125, 15%</b> <b>(0.003)</b>
<b>L_Thalamus</b>	0.08±0.33 (0.27)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.648, 65.8% (0.11)	<b>0.006±0.0007</b> <b>(0.003)</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	<b>0.632, 64.3%</b> <b>(0.01)</b>
<b>R_Thalamus</b>	0.43±0.32 (0.88)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.670, 67.8% (0.99)	0.001±0.004 (0.60)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.653, 66.2% (0.03)
<b>L_Amygdala</b>	2.57±0.25 (0.18)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.637, 64.7% (0.99)	0.001±0.004 (0.99)	0.12	<b>0.209, 23.3%</b> <b>(0.0003)</b>
<b>R_Amygdala</b>	1.67±0.28 (0.43)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.76, 76.6% (0.99)	0.004±0.003 (0.30)	0.28	0.177, 20.1% (0.11)

\* All analyses accounted for socio-economic status, sex, genetic ancestry factor (GAF), and scanner device. All volumes were additionally adjusted for intracranial volume.

After adjustments for multiple comparisons using Holm-Bonferroni correction for the seven subcortical regions per hemisphere, p-values ≤ 0.0036 - 0.01 (rank ordered) were considered significant (bold font)

R<sup>2</sup> and % explained deviance were for the entire model

**Table e-3. Age and Genotype Effects on Cortical Morphometry**

Regions Of Interest (ROI)	General Additive Model* (n=1080)								
	Volume			Area			Thickness		
	<i>APOEε</i> Effect	Age Effect	Age x <i>APOEε</i> Interaction	<i>APOEε</i> Effect	Age Effect	Age x <i>APOEε</i> Interaction	<i>APOEε</i> Effect	Age Effect	Age x <i>APOEε</i> Interaction
Estimated Mean±SD (p-value)	p-value	R <sup>2</sup> Adjusted, % Explained Deviance (p-value)	Estimated Mean±SD (p-value)	p-value	R <sup>2</sup> Adjusted, % Explained Deviance (p-value)	Estimated Mean±SD (p-value)	p-value	R <sup>2</sup> Adjusted, % Explained Deviance (p-value)	
<b>R_Lateral Occipital Cortex</b>	<b>532.5±342.8 (0.005)</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.325, 34.1% (0.07)	<b>136±112.9 (0.005)</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.19, 21%, (0.99)	0.02±0.02 (0.35)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.634, 64.3% (0.99)
<b>R_Medial Orbito Frontal Cortex</b>	126.5±125 (0.59)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.317, 33.3% (0.99)	<b>48.5±36.8 (0.004)</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.17, 18.5% (0.99)	0.03±0.03 (0.29)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.586, 59.6% (0.99)
<b>R_Cuneus</b>	118±118 (0.08)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.258, 27.8% (0.02)	<b>69.2±41.3 (0.006)</b>	<b>0.0007</b>	0.11, 13.4% (0.99)	0.02±0.03 (0.82)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.517, 52.9%, (0.99)
<b>L_Inferior Parietal Cortex</b>	345±415 (0.37)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	<b>0.3, 31.5% (0.002)</b>	102.5±114.8 (0.36)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.17, 19.2% (0.02)	0.009±0.02 (0.41)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.322, 64.2% (0.05)
<b>R_Superior Parietal Gyrus</b>	106.2±360 (0.97)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	<b>0.48, 49.6% (10<sup>-4</sup>)</b>	72.8±111.2 (0.88)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.252, 27.2% (0.02)	0.008±0.02 (0.87)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.698, 7.6% (0.01)
<b>R_Isthmus Cingulate</b>	96.1±77.8 (0.25)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.242, 26.1%, (0.1)	23.9±21.8 (0.25)	<b>0.0002</b>	0.135, 15.8% (0.05)	96.1±77.8 (0.59)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	<b>0.41, 42.9% (0.0004)</b>
<b>R &amp; L_Temporal pole</b>	55.6±47.4 (0.24)	<b>0.004</b>	0.116, 14% (0.01)	8.4±7.2 (0.17)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.135, 15.7% (0.13)	0.01±0.04 (0.91)	<b>0.003</b>	<b>0.07, 8.83% (0.005)</b>

\*All analyses accounted for socio-economic status, sex, genetic ancestry factor (GAF), and scanner device.

After adjustments for multiple comparisons using Holm-Bonferroni correction for the 20 selected ROIs per hemisphere, p-values ≤ 0.0013 - 0.01 (rank ordered) were considered significant (bold font)

**Table e-4. Age and Genotype Effects on Cortical Morphometry only in Children with >50% European Ancestry**

Regions Of Interest (ROI)	General Additive Models in European Only* (n=684)								
	Volume			Area			Thickness		
	<i>APOE</i> $\epsilon$ Effect	Age Effect	Age x <i>APOE</i> $\epsilon$ Interaction	<i>APOE</i> $\epsilon$ Effect	Age Effect	Age x <i>APOE</i> $\epsilon$ Interaction	<i>APOE</i> $\epsilon$ Effect	Age Effect	Age x <i>APOE</i> $\epsilon$ Interaction
Estimated Mean $\pm$ SD (p-value)	p-value	R <sup>2</sup> Adjusted, % Explained Deviance (p-value)	Estimated Mean $\pm$ SD (p-value)	p-value	R <sup>2</sup> Adjusted, % Explained Deviance (p-value)	Estimated Mean $\pm$ SD (p-value)	p-value	R <sup>2</sup> Adjusted, % Explained Deviance (p-value)	
<b>R&amp;L_Hippocampus</b>	<b>128.7<math>\pm</math>90.2 (0.002)</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.274 29.7% (0.02)						
<b>R_Lateral Occipital Cortex</b>				331.9 $\pm$ 171.8 (0.04)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.186 21% (0.99)			
<b>R_Medial Orbito Frontal Cortex</b>				<b>58.9<math>\pm</math>36.9 (0.0004)</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.162 18.6% (0.99)			
<b>R_Cuneus</b>				55.9 $\pm$ 62.6 (0.008)	<b>0.002</b>	0.109 13.4% (0.99)			
<b>L_Inferior Parietal Cortex</b>	294 $\pm$ 390.2 (0.12)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.34 30.7% (0.006)						
<b>R_Superior Parietal Gyrus</b>	403 $\pm$ 541.8 (0.03)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	<b>0.464</b> <b>48.1% (0.0005)</b>						
<b>R_Isthmus Cingulate</b>						0.02 $\pm$ 0.05 (0.25)	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>	0.408 42.5% (0.03)	
<b>R&amp;L_Temporal pole</b>						0.03 $\pm$ 0.06 (0.83)	0.37	<b>0.0567</b> <b>8.32% (0.003)</b>	

\*\* Children were considered from European ancestry when GAF for European was higher than 0.5. Since no Age-by-APOE-by-European status interactions were found on all morphometric and microstructural measurements of our interest, we further analyzed the main effect of Age and APOE genotypes as well as their interactions on those measurements only in children with European ancestry. All analyses accounted for socio-economic status, sex, and scanner device.

R<sup>2</sup> and% explained deviance were for the entire model